

# **DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL**

## **INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS**

TITLE 13, CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, DIVISION 2  
AMEND CHAPTER 5, ARTICLE 5, SECTION 1141

### **Color Requirements for Traffic Law Enforcement Vehicles (CHP-R-2007-02)**

The California Highway Patrol (CHP) proposes to amend regulations in Title 13, California Code of Regulations (13 CCR), relating to color requirements for traffic law enforcement vehicles.

#### **PURPOSE OF REGULATORY ACTION**

Section 2402 of the California Vehicle Code (VC) authorizes the CHP to adopt regulations establishing standards and specifications for, among other items, the color requirements for traffic law enforcement vehicles. Color requirements for traffic law enforcement vehicles are contained in 13 CCR, Division 2, Chapter 5, Article 5.

Color requirements for traffic law enforcement vehicles are described in 13 CCR, Section 1141. The CHP proposes to amend Section 1141 by allowing traffic law enforcement vehicles to be painted in a variety of distinctive colors and paint schemes. In doing so, the revised traffic law enforcement vehicle color requirements will conform to the Legislative intent contained in Assembly Bill 3004 as enacted by the 2006 Legislative session.

#### **SECTION BY SECTION OVERVIEW**

##### **§ 1141. Color Requirements.**

This Section will be amended to require traffic law enforcement vehicles to have a distinctive exterior finish.

Subsection (a)(4) is proposed to permit traffic law enforcement vehicles to be painted any color, with any color front door panels.

Subsection (a)(5) is proposed to require the indicia or names of governmental entities operating traffic law enforcement vehicles to be displayed in sharp contrast to the background on the front

door panels and be of such size, shape, and color as to be readily legible during daylight hours from a distance of 50 feet.

### **STUDIES/RELATED FACTS**

None.

### **LOCAL MANDATE**

This regulation does not impose any new mandate on local agencies or school districts.

### **IMPACT ON BUSINESSES**

The CHP has not identified any significant adverse impact on businesses since these changes simply clarify and expand regulation.

### **ALTERNATIVES**

The CHP has not identified any alternative, including the no action alternative that would be more effective and less burdensome for the purpose for which this action is proposed. Additionally, the CHP has not identified any alternative which would be as effective and less burdensome to affected persons other than the action being proposed.

#### *Alternatives Identified and Reviewed*

1. Make no changes to the existing regulation. This alternative was rejected because it fails to provide for conformance to the Legislative intent contained in Assembly Bill 3004 as approved in the 2006 Legislative session.

### **ECONOMIC IMPACT**

The CHP has determined this regulatory amendment will result in:

- No increased costs for state and local law enforcement agencies.
- No significant compliance cost for persons or businesses directly affected.
- No discernible adverse impact on the quantity and distribution of goods and services to large and small businesses or the public.
- No impact on the level of employment in the state.

- No adverse impact on the competitiveness of this state to retain businesses.